



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## II.—HOSKIER'S GENESIS OF THE VERSIONS.

The notable thesis put forward by Hoskier<sup>1</sup> is a working out of the brief sketch given in his edition of Morgan's Golden Gospels. He unites the opposing views of Harris and Chase<sup>2</sup> in their studies of the Codex Bezae and then proceeds to extend the bilingual relationship to large families of Greek MSS and also to the three earliest Versions, Syriac, Latin, and Coptic. Greek-Latin and Greek-Coptic bilingual MSS exist, and the absence of Greek-Syriac fragments is not a conclusive proof that such a bilingual never existed. In fact the existence of the other bilinguals makes it extremely probable that there was once a Greek-Syriac bilingual, and since Hoskier proves Syriac influence in many Greek and Latin MSS, the point may be considered as settled.

But careful study of the internal evidence has shown a much more complicated state of affairs. Not only are there numerous cases where all or nearly all the Versions agree against the united or almost united testimony of the Greek MSS, but in some cases the influence of one of the Versions on another is undeniable. Of course, in most instances it is a matter of conjecture as to where or why the error arose, but the affinities of the various versions can be definitely established in countless passages, and to have done this over an extremely broad field is Hoskier's real contribution.

When, in Matthew VIII, 12, **κ** reads *ἐξέλουσονται* against *ἐκβληθσονται* of all other Greek MSS, it is easy for us to disregard the error, until we find *ibunt* in the Old Latin MSS *a b c g<sub>1</sub> h q* Irenaeus and Augustine. Furthermore, thus read the Old Syriac (Curetonian and Sinaitic), Peshitto, and even Ethiopic. As Syriac has no compound verbs, *ibunt* of the six Old Latin MSS would seem to be due to Syriac influence, especially as Old Latin *h* has *exient* and Cyprian (once) *exibunt*.

<sup>1</sup> Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the New Testament (Gospels), 2 vols. (pp. 469 and 423). London, B. Quaritch, 1910, 1911.

<sup>2</sup> Compare review of Golden Latin Gospels, A. J. P. XXXII, p. 219.

Just as puzzling to all ordinary explanations is Matthew XIV, 8: *δος μοι φησιν* in all Greek MSS except D (*ειπεν δος μοι*), which is supported by all the Syriacs, Old Latin (*a b c d (e) f ff<sub>1</sub> ff<sub>2</sub> g<sub>1</sub> h k q*), Vulgates (DQ), Sahidic, Bohairic and Ethiopic. So widespread and old was this variant, that we even find a conflation of the two in Old Latin (*g<sub>2</sub> l*) and the Vulgates *p* Oe<sup>1</sup>TZ\*), viz. *dixit da mihi inquit*. This is an error of combination, in which Greek W<sup>1</sup> is now found to agree.

These two examples, out of the many given, will perhaps suffice here, as I shall be continually reverting to the same point. It is evident that there was intimate action and reaction of the Greek and the Versions upon each other for a considerable period, and that very early. The regular use of bilinguals over a long period is perhaps an adequate explanation, but Hoskier's suggestion of trilingual MSS is, in view of the evidence, by no means an impossibility, and certainly affords a more natural explanation for the rapid dissemination of some of the errors. The further suggestion that a great quadrilingual may have once existed will doubtless strike many readers as visionary, though I shall not be surprised if others now explain the puzzling *τρισσα* and *τετρασσα* of Eusebius (*de vita Constantini*, 4, 37), when describing Constantine's order of fifty Bible MSS in the year 331, as references to trilingual and quadrilingual Versions.

After mentioning some of the groups of Greek MSS, which show special Syriac, Latin, or Coptic affinities, Hoskier passes on to the question of a double Greek recension of Mark. All the 35 examples cited show noteworthy variations, which go back before the earliest MSS, yet I am now hardly inclined to accept them as adequate proof of two editions of the original Mark. For some 20 cases involve synonyms or near synonyms, which might easily be interchanged in translation, four are almost certainly due to Latin influence, and, if we include tense changes, as many more might point toward Syriac. It seems that most, if not all, of this evidence can be added to the proofs of bilingual MS influence.

Let us consider Hoskier's treatment of Mark III, 4: "*απολεσαι* is read by LΔ\* and 20 cursives, syr<sup>hier</sup> (syr S, cu not extant) against *αποκτειναι* of all other Greek MSS". The real import of this becomes apparent, when we note that the 20 cursives include

<sup>1</sup> W = the fourth century MS of the Gospels in the Freer Collection.

fam 1, 28, 124, and the lectionaries 44 and 54, all of which often show Syriac influence. Furthermore Old Latin and Vulgate support with *perdere*, to which we may add Armenian, Gothic, a Sahidic lectionary (44<sup>1</sup>), and Greek W. The error perhaps arose through the influence of Luke VI, 9. The most interesting point here is that the bilingual Δ probably represents a form of church reading Bible, as it is supplied with chapter titles, placed in the text, and the Latin version is interlinear. Therefore the support of the Greek and Sahidic lectionaries is natural. The interlinear form of Δ also suggests how an original bilingual might grow into a trilingual if taken to a country where neither of its languages was vernacular.<sup>1</sup>

What might be a translation change is found in Mark IV, 7, where in place of εἰς, the regular Greek, ἐν is read by C D<sup>gr</sup> M<sup>2</sup> and eleven cursives (33, 237, 239, 700 (= Scr. 604), 148,<sup>2</sup> etc.). To these we add W<sup>gr</sup> and Coptic (Bohairic) and note that the Old Latin MS *b* reads *supra*. For the origin of the error compare also Matthew XIII, 7, ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας. Here again we have a Version uniting with a bilingual and a lectionary and all supported by a very early Greek tradition.

To take a case where a parallel Gospel is not involved, in Mark VII, 5 most Greek MSS read ἀνιπτοῖς against κοινῶς of SBDW fam. 1, 28, 33, 565 (= 2 pe), 700 (= Scr. 604), etc., which is in turn supported by *communibus* in Old Latin MSS *d g, r i q* and the Vulgates P<sup>DP</sup><sup>1</sup> LQ Dimma T Durmach Moling, and by Sahidic, Bohairic, and Armenian. The Sinaitic Syriac is quite different, having borrowed the form of Matthew XV, 2, and the later Syriacs agree with the majority of the Greeks. This seems to be an error due to translation and as Syriac attestation is lacking and the Latin divided, one might be tempted to call it Coptic influence. I should, however, prefer to leave that question undetermined, merely asserting that the error arose in and was propagated by the bilingual tradition; it was therefore present in the other column parallel to the Old Syriac, even if not in the Syriac. Hence its presence in the groups of Greek Cursives, which so often show Syriac influence.

<sup>1</sup> I shall use "bilingual tradition" to indicate this family connection of variants, without regard to how many languages or provincial variations are involved. It is similar to the "rewrought text" of Gregory, but I prefer to find the chief cause of error in the use of bilingual MSS.

<sup>2</sup> Gregory's new numbering indicates lectionaries by a prefixed l.

Hoskier next investigates various of the Old Latin MSS to discover Syriac influence, etc., and thus establish their connection with the bilingual tradition. The MS *k* is taken up first as a special example, though it has been regularly considered pure African Latin. One of its ancestors must have been a Greek-Syriac MS, if not Greek-Syriac-Latin. The first example cited is sufficient to establish the existence of some Syriac influence, for in Matthew III, 4, *k* has *zonam loream*<sup>1</sup> with Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac (thong) against all other Latin (*zonam pelliciam*) and Greek MSS (ζωνην δερματινην). The gathering of evidence here was easy, as soon as the idea was obtained, for Sanday, Old Latin Biblical Texts, No. 11, had already collected the special readings of *k* as against the bulk of the Latin MSS. In some 40% of the individual omissions of *k* Hoskier finds that Syriac coincides. Not all of these are due to pure Syriac influence, but the Syriac strain is unquestionably strong.

Among the cases which are less clear we may note: Mark XIV, 51, —επι γυνου. This omission is attested by Greek W, fam. 1, Old Latin *c* and *k*, Sahidic, and Sinaitic Syriac, i. e. in the earliest members of every branch of the bilingual tradition. For that reason it cannot be classed as unquestionably due to Syriac influence, though its origin in the bilingual tradition is certain.<sup>2</sup>

Similarly we may explain Mark XII, 36, where γαρ is omitted by *BLΔTW* fam. 13, *k*, Sinaitic Syriac, and Bohairic, for the presence of *BL* among the authorities merely shows that the old bilingual reading was adopted by the "Hesychian recension", to which von Soden rightly assigns these MSS.

In Mark XII, 27 we perhaps have "Hesychian" influence as *υμεις ουν* is omitted only by *BCLDWk* and Bohairic; yet the inclusion of *ΔW* and *k* among the witnesses would seem to argue for the bilingual origin.

Matthew XIII, 9 is also a little doubtful, for the omission of *ακουειν* is supported only by *BL (a) e ff<sub>1</sub> k* and Sinaitic Syriac

<sup>1</sup> Souter (Jour. Theol. Studies, XIII, p. 122) misses the point entirely in his criticism. The fact that *loream* is an adjective, while the Syriac uses a single noun to express the idea "thong", proves that *k* has borrowed and combined from Syriac, not *vice versa*. The change in the Syriac was occasioned by the use of the verb meaning "to girdle".

<sup>2</sup> Horner's magnificent edition of the Gospels in Sahidic did not appear in season to be used by Hoskier.

(not Curetonian). I have mentioned only cases where I think there is ground for arguing against a pure Syriac origin, and even in these few picked cases the bilingual character of the tradition is undeniable.

The other Old Latin MSS are more briefly treated, but good examples are given showing Syriac influence on *a b c d e* and *q*, both singly and in combination. A very interesting passage is found in Luke V, 3, where *c* alone has *in altum* for *aliquantulum* of the other Old Latin MSS (*b e ff<sub>2</sub> l q*) and *pusillum* of the Vulgate. Old Latin *r*, Moling, Sinaitic Syriac, Peshitto, and Diatessaron have the combined form (*aliquantulum in altum*). D<sup>gr</sup> has *οσον οσον* (= *d quantum quantum*) for the regular Greek *ολιγον*. Armenian omits. There seems to have been a bilingual tradition giving a substitute for *ολιγον*. An older Syriac may or may not have agreed, but the combined form must be very old, even if we admit that it may be a later insert in the Diatessaron. If *r* and Moling are to be traced to this Syriac error, they must represent a later stage of the bilingual text than *c* or even *d*.<sup>1</sup>

Chapter III continues with similar examples of Syriac influence and at the end enumerates the chief syriacizing Greek cursives, viz. fam. 1, fam. 13, 28, 157, 565 (= 2 pe), 700 (= Scr. 604). There follows an attack on the Hort nomenclature, especially the term "Western". Von Soden calls this type of New Testament text the I recension, Gregory, the "rewrought text", and its existence in the East, as well as the West, is fully recognized. We are now learning that it is only the bilingual tradition, with the added probability that the latter included the Service Bible of the early Church and the earliest lectionaries.

On p. 55 occurs a notable sentence which will bear quoting: "Evang. 28 and the Armenian Version, with the others cited above (syriacisers), should afford keys to unlock that very difficult problem of what lay behind the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriacs, some of which survives in old readings in the Jerusalem or Palestinian Syriac (Codices A, B, C) and in the Peshitto itself".

A more thorough understanding of this older Syriac, as well as the determination of the true Old Latin text, is a most urgent need of New Testament study to-day. In the same way we can

<sup>1</sup> Hoskier's references to this passage on pp. 43 and 352 must be corrected by reference to p. 245.

often combine Ethiopic with the bilingual tradition to establish the existence of an earlier Coptic than we now possess, though I doubt if it will be possible to restore much of it with the material now available.<sup>1</sup>

Chapter IV treats primarily of the relative age of the Diatessaron and the first Syriac translations of the Gospels. It is interesting to note how often the bilingual tradition readings, which appear in Sinaitic and Curetonian Syriac, fail in the Diatessaron. This is certainly hard to reconcile with the theory of Burkitt<sup>2</sup> and others, that the Diatessaron was the first Gospel in Syriac and that the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriacs represent a Later Syriac translation influenced by Tatian's great work.

As illustrative examples note Mark II, 27, *εκτισθη* for *εγενετο* in fam. 1, 700, Sinaitic Syriac and Peshitto, while the Diatessaron agrees with the great mass. This can, of course, be explained as an innovation of Sinaitic Syriac or rather of its parent, and so later than the Diatessaron; But the finding of *εκτισθη* in Greek W has seemed to make the tradition too old for such an explanation.

Similar is the omission of *εγω* after *ειμι*<sup>1</sup> in John III, 28, as shown by D<sup>gr</sup> W<sup>gr</sup> 245, *a d ff<sub>2</sub> l aur* and Curetonian Syriac.<sup>3</sup> Either the influence of the Diatessaron has been much overestimated or the Arabic Diatessaron has preserved only a small portion of the peculiarities of the original. It is certain that some adaptation to the later Syriacs is shown in the Arabic Diatessaron, but examples like the first one cited by me above, where the Peshitto also goes with the bilingual tradition against the Diatessaron seem to make such an explanation inadequate. I am inclined to deny any extensive influence of the Diatessaron on the Sinaitic and Curetonian Syriacs and to explain the relationship through Tatian's use of the Syriac column in the old bilingual tradition.

Chapters VI to XI deal with the character and relationships of the Old Latin MS *r*<sub>2</sub>, collated by Abbott in 1884 and since then practically forgotten. This is a fine example of the Irish type of text, sparingly revised on the Vulgate, but having a good Old Latin base throughout. After noting the Vulgate

<sup>1</sup> An excellent almost complete MS of the gospels in Sahidic has just come to light in the famous collection of Coptic MSS recently purchased by Mr. Morgan.

<sup>2</sup> See the Introduction of his edition of the *Evangelion Da Mepharreshe*.

<sup>3</sup> For other examples see Hoskier *passim*.

descendants of  $r_2$  and its parent, Hoskier then passes to the text of the MS itself. Its closest relative is  $k$ , with which it also shares the Syriac base. Over two hundred examples are discussed, illustrating this, and while they do not all show pure Syriac influence, all may be classed as evidence of the bilingual tradition. A few examples will illustrate the general nature of the evidence.

In Luke XII, 47, *et non fecit* is omitted by  $r_2 b c e f f_2 i l q$ , Sinaitic and Curetonian Syriac, Peshitto, Diatessaron, and Armenian, but by only LW 13, 330, 556 of the Greek MSS. In Matthew XI, 26, *placitum fuit* is read in  $r_2 \mathcal{P}^*$ , Wurzburg J, Hieronymus, Ambrosiaster, and Coptic (teste Tisch);  $k$  has *placitum factum est*, Augustine, *placitum est*. Of the Greeks only  $\aleph BW$ , 1, 33, Marc. ap. Irenaeus have this order. All others as well as most of the Latins and all the Syriacs have the order  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\omicron$   $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\kappa\iota\alpha$ . Sahidic expresses with a single word, as also  $f$  and  $f f_1$  (*complacuit*, *placuit*). I believe we have here a plausible reason for the error, and would prefer to call it Old Coptic influence. This would also explain its presence in the "Hesychian" recension.

Luke IV, 36, + *magnus*; thus  $r_2 b d r$  and some Vulgates (GP gat Moling) together with Greek D 253 and Bohairic (10 MSS). Perhaps to be explained as the preceding example.

Luke VI, 26 (*vae*) + *vobis*:  $r_2 b d$  Moling, Syriac, Bohairic, Sahidic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Irenaeus, but in Greek only  $\Delta W^*$  fam. 13, 700 (=Scr. 604), 1 183 and the late cursives. That this reading, after gaining such a foothold in the Byzantine period, was taken over by the Textus Receptus was doubtless due to the parallels in the previous verses. In the earliest period it seems to be defended by the bilingual tradition only.

Luke IX, 28,—*et*:  $r_2$  Moling EGJR, Sahidic, (Bohairic), Armenian, Ethiopic, but only  $\aleph BH$  28 of the Greeks omit. Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriacs agree with the great majority of the Greek and Latin MSS. For that reason and because it is an old Coptic characteristic to omit conjunctions, I am inclined to see Sahidic influence here rather than Syriac with Hoskier, though it must be admitted that the agreement of Greek 28 and Armenian point towards an earlier Syriac.

Luke XI, 33, + *ponit* (after *supra candalabrum*):  $r_2$  with the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriacs and Sahidic only. This may be



due to a chance insertion in  $r_2$  but it looks decidedly like a curious survival.

Luke XII, 56,—*quomodo*:  $r_2$  *c d e ff<sub>2</sub> i l r* Moling, Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriacs, Bohairic (B 28) but only D of the Greeks.

Luke XIII, 13: against λαβων ανθρωπος εβαλεν of all Greek MSS, *accepit homo misit* is found in  $r_2$  alone of the Latins. This reproduces exactly the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriacs, Diatessaron, and Sahidic. Even these few examples, chosen from the many, show clearly, I think, Syriac influence and probably also Coptic. The medium of the influence was in all cases the bilingual tradition.

Chapter VII is devoted primarily to the individual errors of  $r_2$  or its Latin ancestor, but even here some of the examples can be claimed for the bilingual tradition. We may compare Mark XIV, 24, + *in remissionem peccatorum* (borrowed from Matthew XXVI, 28) in  $r_2$  *a g<sub>2</sub>*, Sahidic (all MSS exc. 73, 120), Bohairic and Greek W, fam. 13, 9, 18, 472 and lectionary 13. This combination seems to demand an Old Syriac form to correspond, but it has disappeared, if it ever existed.

Chapter VIII takes up various groups of the Old Latin MSS and shows their interrelationships. All must go back to a common base, which shows Syriac influence. Numerous lists of examples are given showing close relationship in the following groups: *a d r*; *a r*; *a d*; *a e*; *a e r*; *a d e*; *a d e r*; *a d h*; *a d k*, etc.

Chapter IX compares *k* and  $r_2$  in the portions where both are extant and establishes the identity of the text tradition. The authorities are cited fully for all the numerous examples given, so that here also much additional evidence for the bilingual tradition is found. An interesting example is cited from Mark XI, 12;  $r_2$  writes *cum X essurivit* II (*cum XII esurivit* in Vulgates D  $\mathfrak{P}^*Q$ ), while *k* has *esurivit h<sup>is</sup>* (= *hiesus*). Hoskier merely says that *k* shows the secret of  $r_2$ 's madness. I cannot quite agree. Compare Hoskier's Genesis, p. 111, that DLQR used the parent of  $r_2$ , while  $\mathfrak{P}$  seemed to have used  $r_2$  itself. Therefore we establish the addition of *cum* XII for the parent of  $r_2$ , with which also  $g_2$  agrees. The addition was copied from the previous sentence, not intentionally but by accident. For  $r_2$  has also changed *a Bethania* to *in Bethania* (= *Bethaniam*) to correspond with the same verse. εις Βηθανιαν in W<sup>gr</sup>, Bohairic (6 MSS), and Syriac g (36) traces the origin of this part of the transfer to the

bilingual tradition and establishes the age of the error. *Esurivit* IHS of *k* text is supported also by *c*, so that this addition is likewise old. If *r*<sub>2</sub>'s *essurivit* II points to the addition of IHS, as seems probable, it must go back to an earlier stage than either *hī*<sup>s</sup> of *k* or *iesus* of *c*. Therefore it would have to be an error in the parent, not the scribe of *r*<sub>2</sub>.

In addition to other Syriac material chapter X contains special agreements between the Peshitto or the Jerusalem Syriac and various Old Latin MSS against the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriacs. The inference is that the latter have suffered revision and that the real bilingual base is seen in the others. A good example is found in Matthew XXII, 23. *r*<sub>2</sub>, *Dimma*, and F omit *et*<sup>1, 2</sup>. This omission seems to be supported elsewhere by Peshitto alone.

Chapter XI sums up this part of the work with a full study of *r*<sub>2</sub>, *k*, and their Latin allies in Matthew. Examples which show Latin-Syriac affiliation receive special attention. This involves, in some cases, repetition of passages treated earlier, but thereby a better picture of *r*<sub>2</sub> *k* is undoubtedly given. The examples are of the same character as those cited above and are very numerous. I shall single out only a few, in which I should differ somewhat from the author in my treatment.

"Matthew XXII, 1,—*iterum*: *r*<sub>2</sub>, Fgr. *Iterum* (παλιν) is variously transposed by Latins and Greeks, but not omitted outright by others, nor by Diatessaron, nor by Syriac, which, in the case of Curetonian and Sinaitic, heads the verse with it". We may add to the Greek testimony for the omission W and 243. Hoskier is right in calling attention to the frequent transpositions of the word, for we can almost establish the rule that where many MSS transpose, some will omit, and *vice versa*. This however helps us little towards the place of origin of the error, until we find that the Bohairic MSS A\*DΔEFΘJ<sub>1</sub> NOS omit. So the omission may well have occurred first in the bilingual tradition, and the peculiar order of Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriacs, Sahidic and Armenian be due to careless reinsertion. Most Greek MSS, Old Latin *f*, Syriac *g* (15), Ethiopic place παλιν after *ιησους*; 33, Origen and the Vulgate transpose after *ειπεν*; Old Latin and Bohairic (8 MSS) transpose after '*to them*'.

"Matthew XXVI, 9,—*istud*: *r*<sub>2</sub>. So reads Abbott, and with this apparently only *Dimma* and *Moling* agree. But *Lawlor* for *r*<sub>2</sub> prints *haec*, omitting *enim*, but possibly Abbott is right and

this  $h^{\sim}$  stands for *autem*". Thus Hoskier, evidently in despair of reconciling the difficulties. But Greek cursive 157 also omits, so we should claim the omission for the Syriac bilingual tradition and agree with Abbott in the reading for the parent of  $r_2$ , if not for  $r_2$  itself. The abbreviations for *haec* and *autem* are so often confused in Irish hands that the parent of  $r_2$  may well have had *autem*, even if we decide that Lawlor has read  $r_2$  correctly. Furthermore his reading may have been influenced by the well-known variants *hoc* for *istud* in  $d$  and  $h$ ; also Ambrosius seems to have *hoc*, while omitting *enim*, in two passages. Whether we claim  $r_2$  or not for the variant, we have Dimma and Moling joined to the syriacising Greek cursive 157. The omission of *istud* must then be compared with the omission of  $\tau\omicron \mu\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$  in  $\aleph$ ABDE\*L $\Delta\theta^{\circ}$  $\Pi$ W, Syriac, Sahidic, Bohairic, Armenian, Ethiopic, and most MSS of the Old Latin and Vulgate. Only  $F^2$  r uncials 8,  $c$   $q$ , Chrysostom and the late cursives give us the combined form,  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron \tau\omicron \mu\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ . We must consider  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$  the original text and explain  $\tau\omicron \mu\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$  as an explanatory addition, perhaps due to the influence of Mark or John. In a branch of the bilingual tradition it was regarded as a substitute instead of an addition, and so  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$  was omitted.

"Matthew XXVII, 11,—*dicens*; so  $r_2$  R\* and no other Latins, Greeks, or Syriacs. Hilary alone supports". The author inserts this merely for the sake of completeness, but the explanation is apparently the same as in the passage discussed, for Horner notes that the Sahidic lectionary  $m$  omits. Most Greek MSS read  $\omicron \eta\gamma\epsilon\mu\omega\nu \lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\nu$ , but  $W^{gr}$  and Sinaitic Syriac omit  $\omicron \eta\gamma\epsilon\mu\omega\nu$ . This is, I believe, the older error, even if not the original text. How old is suggested by the omission in the Old Latin-Sahidic tradition, for there *dux*, when inserted as an addition was evidently considered a substitute for *dicens*.

Matthew XXVII, 41 also requires mention, as Hoskier has omitted to note how well it establishes that the Diatessaron was later in origin than the basic translation from which Sinaitic and Curetonian Syriacs come. " $r_2$  reads *farisseis* for *senioribus*, agreeing with Sinaitic Syriac, while Diatessaron and Peshitto amplify, including both the elders and the Pharisees, as do a number of the later Greeks (Antioch recension = v. Soden's  $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\iota\eta$ ). Of the Latins  $\theta$   $a$   $b$   $c$   $d$   $ff_2$   $h$   $q$   $r$  *gat* Cassiodorus agree with  $r_2$  here, as does  $D^{gr}$  and a few cursives". The cursives noted by Tischendorf as "al 10" are 63, 64, and the lectionaries

2, 7, 9, 12, 36, 47, 183, 253, etc. This reading is further supported by W<sup>sr</sup>, so we can safely refer it to the old bilingual tradition, which D<sup>sr</sup> and Sinaitic Syriac so regularly represent. In spite of its age it is almost certainly an error, which perhaps crept into the text of some old church service book (cf. the lectionaries above), because the reader thought the Pharisees should be joined with the scribes here, as so often. This change took place in Syriac territory, and there also the combination form was first made, possibly in the Diatessaron, unless we think that the Arabic Diatessaron does not here represent the original form, but only an adaptation to the Peshitto.

In chapter XII there is a discussion of the Diatessaron of Tatian and its relationship to the Old Latin MSS as well as to the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriacs. Our author has treated this subject briefly in an earlier chapter also, and its main thesis is suggested by numerous examples throughout the book, such as the one I have just added above. Hoskier's proofs seem to me conclusive that the bilingual tradition is older than the Diatessaron and therefore not indebted to it. The close relationship which sometimes exists must be due to Tatian's use of an Old Syriac version, and so we win a *terminus ante quem* for the first Syriac translation. In fact, it does not seem that Christianity could have spread far through Syriac territory without some sort of a Syriac translation of the New Testament, even if it were only a sort of interlinear like Δ.

Chapter XIII takes up the Old Latin and the so-called "Western text" again, continuing with a severe attack on the "Neutral text" of B and its allies. Chapter IV, which handles the same theme, should have been transferred to this point and the two united. With the argument as a whole I cannot agree, yet if Hoskier would insert "B text" for "B scribe" in most of the passages treated, I should hardly oppose. In some of the passages there is other fairly good Greek support (cf. omission of δευτεροπρωτω in Luke VI, 1), and to accuse B scribe of the error here is to exalt B as the parent of all having the same error. Yet Hoskier's assertion that there are many deliberate editorial changes and his collection of examples illustrating this view is quite convincing. I believe we must unite the views of Hoskier and von Soden on this point and convict the "H recension" of all these cases of deliberate editing. B may then still remain the most accurate copy of the best early recension.

Whether the editor of this recension really had Unitarian leanings or not, cannot be so hastily decided, and even if convicted, he will doubtless seem less criminal to some of us than to Mr. Hoskier.

The chapter closes with a very full discussion of the noteworthy variants in Luke XXIII, 34, Mark XV, 39 and similar cases of omission. In the case of the omission of the last cry of the Saviour in the form of text found in  $\aleph$ BL, there is a real excursus, which is further supplemented in the Appendix by a long quotation from Dr. Stroud (*On the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*; London, 1871). The interested reader is referred to an article in the *Expositor* of October, 1911, for the medical attitude towards this question.

Chapter XIV draws conclusions and criticises Mrs. Lewis's rather excessive exaltation of the Sinaitic Syriac. On page 436 the author adds some 70 special readings of the Latin MS *gat* (taken from J. M. Heer's new edition), which agree with the parallels previously discussed. Two excellent indices complete the volume.<sup>1</sup>

Volume II contains appendices and is of prime importance. We find first a collation of the Old Latin MS *h* in Mark, Luke, and John (regularly assumed to be pure Vulgate). On pages 3-6 a list of the more interesting readings is given, and also in the collation proper all the important readings are illustrated by a full list of parallels.

The second part contains a study of the Book of Dimma, giving a complete collation of John and all the important readings in Matthew. The value of the MS and its Old Latin-Syriac relationships are well established.

The third part deals with the Book of Moling. This careful study showing the relationship of Moling to the other Old Latin MSS, and also to Greek, Syriac, and especially Coptic, is made extremely valuable by the inclusion of a careful collation of those

<sup>1</sup> I suggest corrections for a few misprints: p. 25, l. 15, omit *p*; p. 27, l. 8, insert *which* before *read*; p. 28, l. 20, omit 473; p. 40, line 18, read—*σε παραδω*<sup>2</sup>; p. 124, l. 26, read  $\Xi$  for X; p. 129, l. 28, read *many Greeks*; p. 139, l. 5, read *εν τη ερημω*; p. 142, l. 7, omit 131 (it belongs to fam. 1); p. 154, l. 1, omit *in* (?); p. 213, l. 24, omit *τα*; p. 229, l. 2, read *omits* for *subdue v*; p. 357, line, 25 "*so also syr on coptic*" is not clear (perhaps read "*syriac survivals in coptic*"); p. 361, l. 10, read VII, 37; p. 448, l. 6, omit ,, 10 102; p. 448, l. 15, below l. 15 insert V, 10 102.

parts of Luke not given by Lawlor in his publication of the MS, viz. I to IV, 5 and IX, 56 to the end. While Moling shows Vulgate revision, the base is Old Latin, which is indeed the foundation of the whole Irish text. This is a most important observation, for the same methods of text dissemination were doubtless used in most other provinces. Only on the basis of such wholesale correction of MSS in use in the various communities, can we explain the rapid spread of the Antioch text. Furthermore rapid and careless correction was sure to leave many traces of the older text. This is the true explanation for the mixed character of text in some at least of the cursive MSS and groups of MSS.

In conclusion I wish to emphasize again the value of the great collection of examples illustrating bilingual influence which Mr. Hoskier has brought together with such industry and accuracy. These will be almost equally useful to those who favor calling this text tradition the "I recension" or the "rewrought text", for they set forth the character and affiliations of a most puzzling text tradition. To me it seems that the use of bilingual MSS is the most adequate explanation for the phenomena studied. The same occurrences are explained in the "rewrought text" of Gregory as due to the action and reaction of the various provincial texts upon each other. This is possibly an easier and more general explanation, but would seem to involve closer intercommunication and a more frequent interchange of Bible MSS between provinces than is generally accepted. The various sub-recensions of von Soden's I recension may be only another way of setting forth the same influences, but does not, on the whole, seem as probable.

HENRY A. SANDERS.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN.